

REMARKS

Claims 19-25 and 29-32 are pending.

The Examiner has objected to claims 23-25 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being improper because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from a multiple dependent claim. In response, the claims have been amended such that no multiple dependent claim depends from another multiple dependent claim.

The Examiner has objected to claims 19 and 30 on the ground that “said electrometer” is indefinite. The claims have been amended to correct this informality. In addition, as suggested by the Examiner, “within” has been changed to “with” in claims 19 and 30. Finally, Applicant has amended claim 21 to address the concern raised by the Examiner under MPEP 2173.05(c).

The Examiner has rejected claims 19-22 and 30 as anticipated by Gritter. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection, on the ground that Gritter fails to show all of the aspects recited in independent claims 19 and 30. Among other features, claim 19 recites “an electromotor that directly drives the wheel of the vehicle” and claim 30 similarly recites “directly driving the wheel of the vehicle with an electromotor.” Gritter fails to teach such a direct drive. By contrast, Gritter interposes a geared transmission between the motor and the wheel of the vehicle:

According to one aspect of the invention, a transmission is provided to mechanically couple the rotor to the tractive wheel. The transmission has an input shaft, and output shaft and selectable multiple gear ratios engagingly disposed therebetween. This arrangement has the advantage of extending the effective operating range of the inventive drivetrain. (Col. 3, lines 23-29).

* * *

Input shaft 32 and output drive shafts 22 are interconnected within transaxle 20 by selectable multiple ratio gear sets engageably disposed therebetween. An example of such a transmission is disclosed in U.S. Pat. No. 4,296,650 which is hereby incorporated herein by reference. (Col. 6, lines 2-7).

Simply put, it is respectfully submitted that Gritter fails to anticipate claims 19-22 and 30, because Gritter fails to teach the direct drive limitations required by the claims.

The Examiner has rejected claim 29 as obvious over Gritter in view of Tsutsumi. Claim 29 depends from claim 19, and thus requires "an electromotor that directly drives the wheel of the vehicle." Neither Gritter nor Tsutsumi teach this limitation. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 29.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees due in connection with this filing Deposit Account 50-0310. A duplicate of this authorization is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel H. Golub

Reg. No. 33,701

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1701 Market Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103

215-963-5055

Dated: March 30, 2007